

015 1.9

THREE
NEW LETTERS

on

SCIENCE
AND RACE

by

CARLETON PUTNAM

Printed and Distributed as a Public Service
by the
NATIONAL PUTNAM LETTERS COMMITTEE

The following three letters written by Carleton Putnam within recent months are largely self-explanatory.

The first replies to an attack in the Summer issue of the magazine *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* published by the University of Chicago Press which contained comments by Wilder Penfield, Theodore Rasmussen and Ward C. Halstead disavowing support of Putnam's position on racial differences. This letter is reprinted from the Autumn issue of the same magazine.

The second letter challenges a statement by Margaret Mead, adjunct professor of anthropology at Columbia University, which appeared in the November 18 issue of *U. S. News and World Report*. It contains a concise summary of the actual evidence on racial differences.

The third is a more personal message to a college classmate who was Special Counsel to Dwight D. Eisenhower when Eisenhower was President. It presents several specific cases of persecution of scientists and suppression of material in the racial area.

NATIONAL PUTNAM LETTERS COMMITTEE
P. O. Box 3518, Grand Central Station
New York, New York 10017

Washington, D.C.
September 10, 1963

Dr. Dwight J. Ingle, Editor
Perspectives in Biology and Medicine
951 East 58th Street
Chicago 37, Illinois

Dear Sir:

In response to your invitation to reply to the letters of Penfield, Rasmussen, Halstead and yourself in your Summer, 1963, issue [*Perspect. Biol. Med.*, 6:539, 1963], I want first to correct certain errors of fact.

You say that my objective is to force racial segregation and to deny civil rights to Negroes. You do this in the face of my repeated statements that I favor segregation only in social—not in non-social—situations, and that I have often pointed out that there is no civil right to school integration save such as derives from the Supreme Court's decision in the *Brown* case. This decision has now been shown to have been based on a misrepresentation of the scientific evidence by the chief witness. [See the Opinion and Judgment of the federal judge in *Stell vs. Savannah Board of Education*, 220 F. Supp. 667. (S.D. Ga. 1963.)] I will also venture the assertion that in the *Brown* case ninety-five percent of the available scientific evidence was never presented to the court at all. Wherever a Negro has an established civil right, I favor it be granted. My position is that the so-called civil right of the Negro to school integration has not been established.

Here I would like to raise a crucial question. All of the scientific arguments mentioned in your letters and the materials on which they are based were extant at the time of the *Stell* trial in May. Why were none of them offered to the court? The answer, of course, is that the authors and

sponsors of this material prefer not to be subject to cross-examination. They prefer to try their case in the mass media, by articles in journals and by pamphlets, where evasions can be practiced far from the discipline of the courtroom and the remorseless logic of opposing counsel. Counsel for the White children were willing to meet the courtroom test. The NAACP was not.

In this connection the last paragraph in Dr. Rasmussen's letter is worth quoting. He says: "I would certainly agree with the importance of securing accurate scientific and controlled data on possible genetic differences in brain structure and function, particularly with the availability of modern neurophysiological and neurochemical tools. I am not aware, however, of any properly controlled study along these lines to date." If the matter is so important, and if Dr. Rasmussen discounts the findings of Bean, Connolly and Vint, does he have any idea why other studies have not been attempted? I believe I can tell him. They have not been attempted because those who wish, for political reasons, to disprove Bean, Connolly and Vint know the results will support these men. *They fear the courts on the existing evidence, and they fear any new evidence which further research may develop.*

I come now to another phase of the matter. You do me an injustice when you state that I cited Halstead and Penfield in a context which "implies" that they share my view on racial differences. I cited Bean, Connolly and Vint (and others) on the racial differences. I then immediately cited Halstead and Penfield on the importance of these differences, the differences themselves having been proved by the prior citations. This is clear enough from the context. Halstead and Penfield have not to my knowledge made any studies of racial differences and seem to know little if anything of the studies of those who have. It is manifestly absurd to write, as Penfield does, that "there is no evidence of differences in the

brains of white man [and] black man. . . ." For reasons which he does not give, Penfield may not like the evidence of Bean, Connolly and Vint, but it is evidence nonetheless.

Next let me remark that while you are correct in saying I am a "nonscientist" in the sense that I am not a professional scientist, I do have a science degree and I also have a law degree. I know something about weighing conflicting claims and I have weighed the conflicting claims of scientists on the issue before us. I have talked to Dr. George and others about the objections set out in the third paragraph of your letter and I can assure you that such deficiencies in controls as you mention do not, in the light of all the other circumstances which I have examined elsewhere,¹ affect the end result, namely, the overwhelming balance of probability that racial differences exist in the morphology of the human brain which in turn account for differences in the capacity to adapt to Western civilization. As Dr. George has succinctly put it, *because the evidence is not perfect is no reason for basing a social revolution on the assumption that the opposite of the evidence is true.* When the balance of probability here is added to all the evidence from other sciences, the total brings us as close to certainty as any reasonable man can ask. It is, in fact, to use a legal expression, "beyond reasonable doubt."

Finally, I have a word to say to Dr. Halstead as to his use of the word "racist" in regard to Dr. George and myself. How, one may ask, is "free inquiry" (which Halstead pretends to champion) to be achieved when any scientist who offers evidence tending to show racial differences is dubbed a racist? The persecution of Carleton Coon for his *Origin of Races*, a badgering by mail and telephone which almost led him to leave the country, ought to be warning enough to men like

¹ I examine several of them in an article entitled "A Reply to Dwight Ingle" in *The Mankind Quarterly*, IV, 1, July-September, 1963.

Halstead as to what dogma needs to be laid to rest before free inquiry can be had.

I shall not express my personal opinion of scientists who, while drifting with the popular leftist tide of the day, will bully and slander an elderly man like George or a devoted scholar like Coon because these men have the courage to speak the truth. But I shall continue to do my best to inform the American public of the source of the false doctrines which have inflamed racial tension throughout the world and which have set the Negro wrongfully against the White man with consequences which grow more serious hourly.

Sincerely,

CARLETON PUTNAM

Washington, D.C.
December 3, 1963

Dr. Margaret Mead
American Museum of Natural History
Central Park West at 79th Street
New York, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Mead:

In the November 18 issue of *U.S. News and World Report* you are quoted as follows: "All the evidence we have at present suggests that any widespread defective achievement which is found [comparatively between races] is the result of faulty education and social deprivation—not of race."

Since in the case of the Negro the truth is precisely the opposite, since all the evidence we have suggests that any defective achievement is due primarily to race and not to faulty education or social deprivation, I am constrained to call this fact not only to your attention but, through a copy of this letter, to the attention of others who are concerned with the racial issue.

Let me as briefly as possible review the available data:

1. In 1950 Dr. C. J. Connolly, Professor of Physical Anthropology at Catholic University, published certain findings in a book which Dr. James Papez of Cornell called "a reliable study of considerable scope the like of which has not appeared in recent times." The book was entitled *The External Morphology of the Primate Brain* and in part involved the study of 60 brains of Whites and Negroes. The nature of Dr. Connolly's findings may be summarized in his own words. "It can be said that the pattern of the frontal lobes in the white brains of our series is more regular, more uniform than in the Negro brain. . . . The white series is perhaps slightly more fissurated and there is more anastomosing of the sulci. . . . It is a matter of frequencies."

There has been no evidence brought forward by anyone to contradict these findings, although some effort has been made to evade their implications. Some people have suggested that we do not know enough about the function of the frontal lobes to evaluate the significance of the differences. However, the functional aspect of these lobes has been considered by Dr. Ward C. Halstead, biopsychologist and Professor of Experimental Psychology, Department of Medicine, University of Chicago, who writes: "The frontal lobes are the portion of the brain most essential to biological intelligence. They are the organs of civilization—the basis of man's hope for the future." Dr. Wilder Penfield, brain specialist and Professor of Neurology and Neuro-surgery at McGill University, confirms Dr. Halstead's position in these words: "The whole anterior frontal area, on one or both sides, may be removed without loss of consciousness. During the amputation the individual may continue to talk, unaware of the fact that he is being deprived of that area which most distinguishes his brain from that of the chimpanzee. After its removal, there will be a defect, but he may well not appreciate it himself. The defect will be in his ability to plan and take initiative . . . , although he may still be able to answer the questions of others as accurately as ever." [Neither Dr. Halstead nor Dr. Penfield has made any studies of the relative characteristics of White and Negro brains and they are quoted solely on the significance of the frontal lobes regardless of race. I do not think it likely that they will conduct racial studies as I believe them to be integrationists.]

There is no need to remind you of the fact that the degree of sulcification of the frontal lobes is in general a measure of evolutionary development. The frontal lobes of the rabbit are smooth. Nor need I point out that those who criticize Connolly on the ground of inadequate sampling have shown a surprising lack of eagerness to provide a better one.

2. In 1934 Dr. F. W. Vint of the Medical Research Laboratory, Kenya, Africa, published the results of a comparative study of Negro and European brains in which he found that the supragranular layer of the Negro was more than 14% thinner than the White's. On the significance of this finding I will quote Dr. W. C. George, formerly head of the Department of Anatomy, University of North Carolina Medical School: "Since structure is a guide to general function in all those activities that have been adequately analyzed, it would seem rash to disregard structure in any consideration of the higher mental functions. In this connection it seems very significant to me that the cells of the infragranular layer have extensive primary connections with the lower brain centers while the connections of the cells of the supragranular layer are largely intracortical. This is powerful evidence of their primary participation in the special functions of the cortex—the organ of civilization."

The thickness of the supragranular layer of the cortex, which is found to increase as we move up the scale from animals to man, may thus be said to be another measure of evolutionary development.

To my knowledge, the only attempt yet made to discredit Vint's findings has consisted in the suggestion that differences in health or preservative techniques may have caused differences in shrinkage which would invalidate his measurements. Dr. George, however, has pointed out that there is no reason to assume that shrinkage would have affected the Negro's supragranular layer without at the same time affecting his lamina zonalis which in every case proved thicker in the Negro than in the White.

Here again any new studies by those who might wish to contradict Vint (and they have available ample resources to conduct further research) have been notable by their absence.

3. There is, I suppose, no dispute about the fact that, *other things being equal* (such as sex, body size, proportion of parts and sulcification) the weight of the brain correlates with intelligence. This again has been found to be true throughout the series of vertebrate animals.

Various studies have been made of the comparative average weights of White and Negro brains with results that all fall within the range of about an 8-12% lower weight for the Negro brain. Such studies have been published by Bean, Pearl, Vint, Tilney, Gordon, Todd and others. I have never seen any findings which contradicted these, although efforts have been made to confuse the issue by injecting sex, body size and similar variables which are eliminated in the initial hypothesis. The evidence is simply that, as a racial average, the Negro brain is lighter than the White and that this, in turn, indicates a lower average level of intelligence. In the words of Dr. Carleton Coon, immediate past president of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, "among living populations, absolute brain size is generally, although not necessarily individually, related to achievement." While I dare say there may be exceptions proving this rule, competent physical anthropologists tell me that neither the Eskimo nor Neanderthal man is among them.

4. We are very recently indebted to Dr. Coon for the book, *The Origin of Races*. By the evidence of fossil remains in Europe and Africa this book exhaustively documents the hypothesis that the White race crossed the evolutionary threshold from *Homo erectus* to *Homo sapiens* some 200,000 years ahead of the Negro. In this book Dr. Coon refers to the "great variability of twentieth-century human beings in *evolutionary grades* [emphasis mine] as well as in racial lines."

No serious attempt has been made to refute the basic hypothesis of *The Origin of Races*. The usual smoke-screens of undocumented general

denials and prolix evasions of the fundamental issue have appeared in the journals. Dr. Theodosius Dobzhansky, a specialist in fruit flies, has challenged the likelihood of parallel evolution, only to be met in Dr. Coon's rebuttal by specific examples of such evolution and by the probability of peripheral gene flow. On October 25, the Literary Supplement of the London *Times* in a special number devoted to the leading scientific books of 1963 referred to *The Origin of Races* as "a landmark in the development of the science [of physical anthropology]".

5. You are undoubtedly aware that methods have been worked out for measuring the speed of kinesthetic learning from birth to the first years of life—learning, that is, which involves the transition from uterine to infant patterns of muscular reflex and control. This speed seems to be inversely correlated with the ultimate complexity to be attained by the mind and, in particular, by the cerebral cortex. (In all mammalian life full mental stature develops early in direct relation to cerebral simplicity.) Thus, neonatal kinesthetic development is more rapid among gorillas than among chimpanzees, and many times faster among chimpanzees than among human infants.

It is consequently logical to assume that gross differences in the rate of kinesthetic maturation between human races would have a bearing upon the complexity or evolutionary status of the structure of their brains. In 1956 Dr. Marcelle Geber made studies of normal infants in Kampala, Uganda, for the World Health Organization. She discovered that developmental milestones were reached several times more rapidly by Negro than by White infants. To my knowledge no attempt has been made to disprove her findings.

6. From the sciences of genetics and blood-group studies I quote the words of Dr. Garrett Hardin, Professor of Biology at the University of

California: "As a result of recent findings in the fields of physiological genetics and population genetics, particularly as concerns blood groups, the applicability of both the inequality axiom and the exclusion principle is rapidly becoming accepted." I also quote Dr. Clyde Kluckhohn, Professor of Anthropology at Harvard, who shortly before his death in 1959 turned from the equalitarianism of his youth and wrote "On the premise that specific capacities are influenced by the properties of each gene pool, it seems very likely indeed that populations differ quantitatively in their potentialities for particular kinds of achievement."

7. When we come to the area of psychological testing we are, of course, dealing with secondary evidence. These tests do not give *direct* proof of the genetic nature of racial limitations in intelligence such as is contained in the anatomy of the brain. Moreover it will never be possible completely to equate White and Negro "environment" without making the Negro into a White man. However, in the *American Psychologist* for May 1962, Dr. Henry E. Garrett, for fifteen years head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia, discusses six cases in which every effort was made to equalize environmental factors between the two groups tested. Dr. Garrett reports the results as follows: "Negro overlap of white norms when groups are matched for various educational and socio-economic factors does not increase markedly as compared with overlap in random samples. This is true for elementary, high school, and college groups. Instead of the evidence for diminished differences between Negroes and whites of comparable status being 'overwhelming' it is, in fact, non-existent."

As environment is improved the Negro does better, but so does the White. The gap remains virtually the same. The tests corroborate the direct evidence from other sciences, namely, that the

Negro's limitations are chiefly innate. Garrett's estimate, confirmed by Sir Cyril Burt and based upon the Newman Holinger Study of identical twins and the geneticists's Concordance Index, is that environment contributes about 25%, inheritance 75%, to human capacity, the ratio varying somewhat with different characteristics. Obviously a man's or a race's genetic limitations eventually influence their environment so that the one compounds the other.

It is necessary also to note here Sir Julian Huxley's recent finding that a difference of one and one-half percent in average I.Q. makes a difference of fifty percent in the number of those having an I.Q. of 160 or higher. Since the Negro I.Q. ranges from fifteen to twenty percent below that of the White it is easy to understand the relative dearth of Negro intellects throughout human history. And since a civilization is totally dependent for leadership upon a thin top layer of its population, it is equally obvious that any amalgamation of the races would be disastrous for our culture.

Such, then, is the cumulative and converging testimony from anatomy, histology, physical anthropology, genetics and psychology. While no single item may constitute *proof*, each item constitutes *evidence*, and I believe I am justified in saying that the total of the evidence must amount to proof to any unbiased mind. When the sum is added to the testimony from history, the result is beyond reasonable doubt. Nothing in the self-conflicting and undocumented edicts of UNESCO, an organization with a notorious leftist bias, nor in the statements of various scientific cliques and organizations offers anything factual in contradiction.

This is not, however, the immediate question. Your statement in *U.S. News and World Report* reads: "All the evidence we have at present suggests that any widespread defective achievement

which is found is the result of faulty education and social deprivation—not of race.” In other words, you not only deny the overwhelming nature of the evidence against your point of view, you categorically assert that it does not exist. It seems to me that this can only be due to ignorance or oversight on your part.

I therefore invite you publicly to retract your statement. The American people have been misled long enough by visionary equalitarian propaganda claiming its ultimate support in scientific circles. It is time all of us realized that the constant parroting of denials of the existence of well-established evidence does not constitute its refutation, that undocumented resolutions couched in equivocal language by scientific societies have no probative value, and that the perversion of truth in the interest of left-wing politics must be stopped. We are getting entirely too familiar with the Communist technique of the big and constantly repeated lie; I am sure you would want to be the last to be associated with it.

Sincerely,

CARLETON PUTNAM

Washington, D. C.
December 9, 1963

David W. Kendall, Esq.
179 Earl Court
Grosse Pointe Farms, Michigan 36

Dear Dave:

I have been long in answering your letter of October 17 but let me assure you that we are indeed still both members of the Class of '24. Right now I intend to presume on that fact to say a few things I might not say otherwise.

In your letter you write: “I just could not disagree with you more about the President's position with regard to the Supreme Court.” As is customary with those who take this attitude, you offer no grounds for it, nor will I waste time examining all the shop-worn probabilities. I am going to review a minimum of fundamentals and draw some conclusions.

On December 6 I mailed you a copy of a letter dated December 3 which I had written to Margaret Mead, the popular cultural anthropologist. In it I summarized the scientific evidence against the environmentalist view of the Negro problem. This evidence is extensive. Taken together with the material presented to the Court in *Stell v. Savannah Board of Education*, a copy of which I sent you earlier, it contradicts to the last item the testimony on which the Supreme Court based its decision in *Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka*.

But regardless of the evidence, I do not believe I overstate the matter when I say that it should have been obvious from the beginning, and continuously thereafter, that there was something wrong with the *Brown* decision. Riots, bayonets and murder do not indicate public enthusiasm over a cataclysmic change in government policy engineered by nine men on a court. At least they raise some doubts. There has been much talk

since Kennedy's assassination about an atmosphere of hatred and anger in the United States and many leftists have tried to lay this at the door of conservatives. But if we searched the history of the country since the Civil War for the single item which has done most to create such an atmosphere, we would be obliged to name the decision in *Brown*.

When, in addition, the attention of two Presidents is called, not only to the scientific fallacies involved but to the misrepresentations and deceptions practiced (Clark and Kelly) as well as to the socialist and communist flavor of the testimony offered (the racial position of the witnesses and scientific citations in *Brown* is the straight Communist line) I would think an alert and responsible Chief Executive would feel that the time had come to look into the matter for himself.

As to Eisenhower, I am advised by an authority I believe to be reliable that had it not been for the influence exercised upon the Court by Brownell and Rankin, representing the Executive Branch, the 1954 decision would never have been handed down. At least it seems clear that if the influence had been in the opposite direction this tragic event would not have occurred. This places an initial responsibility upon Eisenhower. I am not suggesting that he should have followed Andrew Jackson's example and said to the Court, "You've made the decision, now you enforce it." I am suggesting that had he studied the situation and discovered the truth he could have openly announced himself in disagreement with *Brown* and, through the unrivalled pulpit of the Presidency, have brought public opinion to demand its reversal. One does not have to go far back in history to find a President who openly disagreed with the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, with a Court so closely divided as this one privately was, a nod from Eisenhower in the early stages could have changed the whole course of events.

Similarly as to Kennedy, when I heard him say on TV ("Conversation with JFK"—NBC) in answer to a question about Oxford, Mississippi, "What else could we do? We had a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court with three Southern judges—we had to enforce it," I wondered if it had ever occurred to him that throughout his administration he had been blindly embracing that decision and encouraging the public to embrace it without making any effort whatever to examine the underlying issues. There is plenty a President can do in such a situation, plenty Eisenhower and Kennedy could have done and that Eisenhower, Johnson and Nixon could still do, given the desire.

The responsibility grows greater when we stop to remember the suppression of research and the persecution of scientists prevalent today and unequalled since the time of Galileo.¹ I will cite you six examples of this situation from my personal knowledge, having in some cases changed the name of the sciences and the location of the universities for the protection of the individuals involved:

1. A professor of psychology at a Northern university published a statistical study of the comparative mental-test scores of Negroes and Whites of similar socio-economic status. Since his findings were that the Negro averages are consistently and significantly lower, even under conditions of equalized environment, delegations from two racial pressure organizations—one Negro and one Jewish—requested his university to fire him; the doors of other universities were closed in his face, and a professional society in his field of specialization refused to admit him to membership on the grounds that his opinions might be offensive to its Negro members.

¹ In the case of Galileo the persecution was not used as a tool of social revolution and genocide, and was therefore infinitely less dangerous.

2. A professor of sociology at a Southern university testified before a certain investigating committee in a sense adverse to the equalitarian dogma. When he returned to his campus he was told: "We won't fire you—that would be too obvious. But as long as you stay here, you will never get a promotion and you will never get a raise in pay."

3. I have a letter from an official of a certain scientific society concerning a young member who voted in favor of an equalitarian resolution at a meeting of that society. I quote in part: "As for X——, he said nothing at all at the meeting but just sat there like many others; he apologized to me in advance for not voting on the [non-equalitarian] side on the grounds that should he do so his job would be in danger. He was probably right. I don't see what else he could have done under the circumstances."

4. I quote from a letter from a professor of anthropology at a large Western university: "It is with regret that I must decline this opportunity to express again publicly my belief in this matter [genetic racial inequality]. Letters, telephone calls, and threats after my statement in —— were not favorable nor encouraging. Further exposure in the press could destroy any value that might come from my research now in progress and that which is planned for the immediate future."

5. A retired professor of psychology whose text book has been an authority in the field for many years and has sold over fifty thousand copies told me on the telephone last night that his publishers had advised him they were going to discontinue further publication because his recent stand against the equalitarian view, though unconnected with his book, had antagonized certain school administrations.

6. I quote from a letter received last month from a professor of biology at an Eastern university who had prepared voluminous material on genetic racial differences: "Within the next few days [after my decision to publish had been reached] the president [of the university], X——, summoned me to his office, and in the presence of the Dean of the Faculty, Y——, and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Z——, formally forbade me to publish any of this material. This was a formal and official prohibition, with some mumbling about academic freedom. I could only submit. There have been other pressures, most of which have been subtle. There is no point in recounting them. For example, my retirement will occur next——, and from a more than adequate income, my monthly total will be less than——. I will squeak through somehow, but I call attention to two Federal and one state job which have died on the vine, and a hint from a competent source that I had better be quiet if I expect to get a book published [on another subject]."

I will not take your time with more examples although I can provide as many as you want, beginning with the harassment of Carleton Coon. I have been dwelling for years on the suppression of evidence and the persecution of scientists. Some of the above cases I have already cited publicly and brought them to the attention of government officials, including those mentioned in this letter. Taken together with all the other factors, they were more than enough to alert our political leaders to a need for investigation. They easily explained the all-to-nothing votes (typical of ballots under authoritarian regimes) given to the press by scientific associations under the control of leaders of the radical left with the apparent intent of further forcing upon the public mind the socialist racial concept. Brain washing and intimidation are not reassuring research techniques.

So now I come to the crucial question: How much of an effort did Eisenhower, or Kennedy after him, make to inform himself on the facts behind the *Brown* decision? Here was a case of transcendent importance to our domestic and foreign policy with sirens blowing and red lights flashing all over it. Here was an issue bitterly dividing our people. Did either man once talk to—or study the opinions of—any scientist other than those parroting the socialist, Boas line? Did either man ask to see Garrett or George or Gates or Coon? Did Nixon do so as a candidate? And if not, why not?

Certainly there would have been no impropriety in inviting these distinguished men to the White House. Garrett had been head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia for 15 years, George had been head of the Department of Anatomy at the North Carolina Medical School for 10 years, Gates was probably the world's leading geneticist, and Coon was a Viking Medal winner in physical anthropology as well as president of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists. I am curious to know whether any of our national leaders had the intellectual curiosity to talk to a single one of them.

It seems to me the least they ought to have done after a meeting with them and after comparing their views with the empty verbiage on the other side (an emptiness which any intelligent person can soon discover for himself) was to have established a public Panel made up of scientists on both sides for the purpose of conducting tests against which no charge of bias or inadequacy could be levelled in all the relevant sciences and in all areas of race differences. All the scientists I have named would have welcomed such tests. They would today be only too happy if the facts were the opposite of what they know them to be, and so would I.

The racial issue is fundamental to the future of Western civilization. Back of it lies the even

more fundamental question of the biological equality of man, and this in turn is basic to any approach to the Communist ideology and the whole world structure. To shrug off this question, or avoid it because of the Negro vote, would be one of the most disastrous exhibitions of opportunism on record. It would not even be shrewdly selfish, because the nation at this very hour is inflamed North and South by half-formed realizations, as well as bewilderment, and is waiting for enlightened leadership. Any President who gave the public well-documented facts on the race issue, who pointed out the ignorance and fraud on which the integration movement has battered, who called for the reversal of *Brown* and in its place instituted a campaign to desegregate the Negro in all non-social situations while maintaining inviolate the principle of social segregation, would gather round him such a tide of popular support that the Negro vote would be lost in the torrent.

Yet what are we to conclude from the current posture of Eisenhower, Nixon and Johnson? My guess is that they know nothing about the basic issues and have not even had the initiative to inquire. All they need do today is to pick up Nathaniel Weyl's latest book, *The Geography of Intellect*, and read one short section on pages 259-263, "The Treason of the Scholars", to be alerted to what is going on. Yet they will not do so. They will be too busy appeasing minority groups to undertake educating and leading the majority.

Such is my reaction to your comment about "the President's position with regard to the Supreme Court". I am sickened by the futility of the whole pattern. From it only frustration and deterioration can result for all segments of our society. Race tension is increased in the United States, White man is set against White man, family against family, section against section, and the jungle begins to creep back over Africa.

Next to moral integrity, nothing is so important in public life as intellectual integrity. One can build neither a healthy nation nor a healthy world on the evasion or corruption of truth. David Lawrence recently wrote an editorial in *U.S. News and World Report* on the importance of Love. I would agree with him. I would put only one thing ahead of it. I would put Truth ahead even of Love, for the burden Love must carry when Truth is betrayed is insupportable.

Sincerely,

CARLETON PUTNAM

cc: Lyndon B. Johnson
Dwight D. Eisenhower
Richard M. Nixon

P.S. Allow me a quotation from page 261 of Weyl: "The power-seeking [and popularity- and promotion-seeking—C. P.] intellectual in the non-Soviet world becomes a self-appointed champion of the rights of the proletariat or 'the common people.' This enables him to disguise his ambition in the garments of specious altruism and humanity. Often he begins by deceiving himself and only later deludes others. The historic record is filled with instances in which the idealistic intellectual, having gained power, does not hesitate to commit any and all crimes in the name of the proletariat or the people, or even against them, as a means of consolidating and aggrandizing that power.

"In America, the intellectual is not dazzled by Marxism, but by the aura of Marxist concepts, filtered through the fuzzy and untrained minds of non-Communist interpreters. What results is an inchoate congeries of socialistic doctrines, which are neither coordinated and systematized, nor even called by their right name. The socialism of the mentally unkempt in the United States is generally known as 'liberalism' or 'progressivism'."

Copies of this pamphlet
"Three New Letters
on Science and Race"
or
Copies of the address
"The Road to Reversal"
or of another address
"These Are the Guilty"
may be obtained at the following prices:
1 to 2 copies - free
3 to 99 copies - 18¢ each
100 or more copies - 15¢ each

Copies of "Opinion and Judgment by
Judge Frank M. Scarlett in *Stell v.
Savannah Board of Education*"
may be obtained at the following prices:
1 to 9 copies - 30¢ each
10 to 99 copies - 25¢ each
100 or more copies - 20¢ each

Copies of Dr. W. C. George's
"The Biology Of The Race Problem"
are available as follows:
1 to 9 copies - 50¢ each
10 to 99 copies - 40¢ each
100 or more copies - 35¢ each

NATIONAL PUTNAM LETTERS COMMITTEE
P. O. Box 3518, Grand Central Station
New York, New York 10017